



PUBLISHED DAILY AND WEEKLY BY  
EDGAR SNOWDEN.

MONDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 11, 1878

In the Senate, to day, there was an avalanche of memorials in favor of woman suffrage. The Silver bill was further discussed by Mr. Davis, of W. Va., and others.

In the House of Representatives the States were called for bills, &c., and a large number introduced and referred. The Pioneer Mills bill was defeated.

Both houses agreed upon the order of ceremonies for the reception of a picture of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation, which takes place in the House to-morrow at 2 p. m.

Mr. Chandler is after the President again. He now says that "after Mr. Hayes's actual installation, secured by a prior secret bargain, that he should do so, he actively and personally tore down the lawful State governments of South Carolina and Louisiana and established rebel mob governments in their stead, violated the republican pledges to protect human rights and maintain the supremacy of the law, released negro murderers whom he was elected to prosecute and punish, gave Federal power to the South to rebel democrats, glorified the rebel soldiers at the expense of Union soldiers, taunted the black race with its helplessness and shamefully boasted of its betrayal of it. Also that this, his degradation of himself and his betrayal of his party, has annihilated its organization at the South, making republican ascendancy there impossible, and has almost destroyed the party at the North; so that the only way to prevent a democratic victory in 1880, by reason of a solid South and a divided North, is to promptly repudiate an administration and a policy which is dishonoring, paralyzing and destroying the republican party." Some, who take a surface view of things, believe that Mr. Chandler represents only a small portion of the republican party, but those who talk with republicans, and read republican newspapers, and who can see beneath the veneer put on the President by officeholders, applicants for office, and those who hope to be benefited in some way by the Administration, are convinced that a favorable opportunity for effective opposition is all that is wanted by the party to which Mr. Hayes belongs, in order for them to make it. Among republicans, he is supported only by such men as have been, are, or hope to be, directly or indirectly, benefited by his administration. The rest of his party have no use for him, and would depose him to-morrow, if they could, were it not that such deposition would be advantageous to the democrats. Mr. Hayes ought to know this as well as anybody else, but he does not, and is still engaged in the necessarily futile task of trying to win back to his support a party whose supremacy is incompatible with peace in one half, and prosperity in the whole, of the country. The only party upon which he can rely for support is the democratic—because, in supporting him that party supports peace, good will and prosperity throughout the length and breadth of the land—and, yet, in response to the demands of his radical enemies, he has announced that he will appoint no more democrats to office, though all he ever did appoint would not amount to a dozen.

#### The Dead Pope and Sacred College.

The public were admitted to St. Peter's to view the remains of the Pope at 6:30 yesterday morning. The crowd was tremendous, and many women fainted from the pressure. A company of soldiers had to enter the church to regulate the passage of the crowd. The body of the Pope, arrayed in Pontifical robes, lies on a crimson bed, at each end of which stands a member of the Noble Guard with drawn sword. The bed is surrounded by twelve large candelabra, and is so placed that the feet of the deceased are outside the altar rails, in order that the faithful may kiss them. The face is calm and unchanged by death.

To-day, on the arrival of the foreign Cardinals at Rome, the Sacred College will permanently constitute itself in congregation. A bull left by Pius IX. authorized the Cardinals to deviate from the established procedure, but does not prescribe any special rules.

The Riforma states that the Conclave will last a long time. At one of the next congregations the Cardinals will consider the question of permitting absent Cardinals to telegraph their votes.

The Riforma also states that Monsignor Lasagni, Acting Papal Secretary of State, has sent a note to the Nuncios protesting against any Power exercising the veto, and stating that perfect tranquility and independence are assured to the Conclave in Rome. The Italian Government has ordered eight additional battalions to Rome.

The newspapers narrate a stormy and acrimonious scene at the Congregation of the Cardinals, Cardinal Manning, at the head of the extreme Ultramontane, wishing the Conclave to meet at St. Albans. Even the word "schism" was uttered. Later events count that the minority against holding the Conclave at Rome is insignificant.

The Riforma says: "The Roman and German Cardinals wish to elect a Pope of advanced age; the Italians, one not intimately connected with the events of the late reign. The Italian Government has telegraphed the foreign governments pledging the security of the Conclave."

**Ex-Senator Wade's Condition.**  
CINCINNATI, O., Feb. 11.—Dispatches from Jefferson, Ohio, last night, represent that ex-Senator B. W. Wade is in a more critical condition than at any time since he was first attacked. Being in his 78th year his recovery is doubtful.

#### The Alexandria Delegates on the State Debt.

During the debate on the Barbour bill, the passage of which was announced in Saturday's Gazette, the two members of the House of Delegates from this city delivered the following speeches:—

##### MR. MUSHBACH'S SPEECH.

Mr. Mushbach stated that he approached the discussion of the debt question with an open mind, and that he felt it his duty to defend his position and give his views on the question, and in so doing would endeavor to refrain from recapitulating arguments previously made by other gentlemen, and call the attention of the House to a few considerations that seemed to have escaped the attention of the speakers who preceded him, and had not been referred to. Preliminary he would say that he was no friend of the Funding bill of 1871. He and other gentlemen on the floor had been derisively called "funders," under the idea that the principles and policy of that bill met with their full approval. Such was not the case with him. He believed it to be an unfortunate measure and one of the causes of the troubles that now enveloped the State and has brought to the floor of this House so many men committed to what he believed to be unconstitutional measures. It is not, however, the sole cause of the present condition of affairs. That is ascribable as much to the non-action of succeeding legislatures, their failure to meet the case in time, and their persistent devotion to the effort to find out how not to pay the debt, as to the enactment of the bill itself. Denunciations and fulminations had been hurled thick and fast from this floor against that unfortunate bill, and the righteousness of most of the strictures he assented, but he would be blithely to that which had passed into history, and deaf to the logic of events, did he fail to recognize the fact that, however objectionable the Funding bill may be, however unfortunate in that it tied up and lost to the State the control of a large part of her own revenues, however iniquitous even, it has been decided by the Supreme Court of this State that it contained a contract which cannot be violated, and any attempt direct or indirect, sophistical or plausible, to impair or nullify it, is unconstitutional, void and of no effect. Gentlemen seem to think that the Court of Appeals, seeing the State of the public mind and the present condition of affairs, will reverse itself if a new case is made up for it. Mr. Mushbach did not believe that. That court is composed of men incapable of self-stultification. Behind the Funding act, upholding and sustaining the coupon feature of it, is the constitution of the United States backed by the power of the Federal Government, and if a court should for any reason reverse its decision, or if it refuses to do so, and is itself "readjusted," it then becomes necessary to get the Supreme Court of the United States to turn its back upon a long line of its own precedents. It is too late to say that it was wrong to pass the act, because it capitalized the arrears of interest, committed Virginia to the payment of war interest and that which accrued during the reconstruction period, and withdrew from her the control of her revenues for a number of years. Suffice it to say that whether right or wrong, fraudulently or fairly, it became a law, and the decision in *Antoni vs. Wright* made it an accomplished fact by assent that the attempt to repeal the coupon feature of it violated a contract, and when that decision was rendered the matter passed out of the range and domain of controversy.

The courts cannot and will not go into the inquiry whether a law passed by a Legislature was procured and passed through fraud or bribery. This has often been decided and is settled law. Mr. Mushbach continuing, explained the bill now under consideration, and said that it was proposed by it to circumvent the Funding bill of 1871, the Court of Appeals, and the constitution of the United States by means of a preamble. That preamble sets out the statements, that a further increase of taxation is impracticable—that the revenues of the State at the present rate of taxation will not enable the State to maintain its governmental organization by paying the necessary expenses incident thereto, and at the same time sustain the system of free schools and pay the present rate of interest on the amount claimed as the principal of the public debt, and that the preservation of the State government is absolutely necessary. The bill then provides that of the present rate of taxation, viz., fifty cents on the hundred dollars, one half thereof shall be paid in cash to support the government, ten cents shall be paid in cash to support the free schools, and fifteen cents may be paid in any way, say in coupons, for interest on the public debt. In other words the friends of the present bill acknowledging that the Funding bill was a contract by and under which coupons were made receivable for taxes, and though the Court of Appeals has sustained the bill, and though the constitution of the United States provides that no State shall pass a law impairing the obligation of contracts, yet they claim that the bill now under consideration will stand the test of the courts, because it is essential to the preservation and safety of the State that it should be passed and that the State in the exercise of its sovereignty may disregard the provisions of the 10th section of the 1st article of the U. S. Constitution providing for the inviolability of contracts—also that said 10th section only applies to contracts between individuals, and not to sovereign States, &c. These positions Mr. Mushbach said, though plausible, are not tenable. He would not base his argument on *Antoni vs. Wright*, which had been read and reread, twisted and construed and dodged around, so often on this floor, that the mention of the case had a nauseating effect on the listeners, but he would go back to the beginning.

The State parted with such of its sovereign rights as are in conflict with the prohibitory clauses of the Constitution of the United States when it entered into the confederation of States and assented to that constitution. Prior to entering into the Union it had a right to coin money, issue bills of credit, make treaties and alliances, impair contracts, &c., but it parted with the right of a sovereign State so far as the power to emit bills of credit is concerned—so far as the right to coin money is concerned—so far as the right to make treaties and alliances is concerned—and so far as the power to pass any law impairing the obligations of contracts is concerned. The State is sovereign only in those powers not delegated to the United States.

It is asserted that to form a more perfect Union, to establish justice, and to promote the general welfare it would subordinate its sovereignty to the particulars. It is true that gentlemen of the past, and cease the assertion of those doctrines of State rights, which the results of the war, the decisions of the courts, as now constituted, and the present and prevailing construction of the character of our Government should convince them is mere dogmatism. It is cruel to lead the people to believe that this bill will relieve them of their difficulties. Mr. Mushbach, as a democrat could not assent to the destruction of State rights and the centralizing tendencies of the age, but neither could he close his eyes to the signs of the times, and the now accepted and enforced doctrines on that subject. Members on this floor go as far beyond John C. Calhoun in this matter of sovereignty as Calhoun went beyond Webster. But the supporters of the Barbour bill, while acknowledging the existence of the provision "against the obligation of contracts," propose to override and circumvent it by and through the efficacy of a preamble, containing statements which are not facts, but which they say, the courts cannot enquire into or go behind because it is the declaration of the political

power of the State, the Legislature, and its declaration that it is necessary, to impair the contract previously made in order to preserve the State and give it control of its own revenues, must be taken as true and incontrovertible, and justifies the impugning. Mr. Mushbach acknowledged the principle that the judicial power will not interfere with political questions or with the political power, further than to pass upon the constitutionality of their acts. The courts will not go behind this preamble, say the forcible readjusters. That is true, they will not go behind it. They will go right over it, and beyond it and heed it not. They will go back to the original funding bill and say, here is your contract and though it may be, stood up to it. You cannot by a preamble rid yourself of its obligations. An indirect, seditious attempt to avoid it is as obnoxious as a direct attempt and will meet with the same fate. The direct attempt of 1871 did. We cannot be permitted to trample the Constitution under our feet by means of preambles. If a law was introduced in this Legislature nakedly to provide that from and after its passage the State of Virginia should emit bills of credit or coin money, every member would rise to his feet and shout at it as unconstitutional. It could scarcely get a vote in this body. But the position of the advocates of the new doctrine is such that if the bill to provide for the coining of money, or for emitting bills of credit is preceded by a preamble containing the statement that it is necessary to do so to the end that the sovereignty of the State may be maintained, and to enable it to pay its governmental expenses, then the bill is unobjectionable, and the Constitution of the United States goes for naught. Suppose a bill is introduced providing that hereafter none but white persons shall be allowed to vote in Virginia, and one of us would vote for it, its unconstitutionality being so unquestionable. But the advocates of the measure would then put a prefix to it declaring that the evils of universal suffrage are such that no honest men could be elected to office, that those elected were incompetent, or that they either failed to collect the taxes, or stole them when received, and that such a state of affairs existed as to endanger the safety of the State, and destroy its government and sovereignty. Then it seems the bill would be invulnerable, and the constitutional provision circumvented. If this be true, you can destroy the whole Constitution by a judicious use of preambles. This is an absurdity. Mr. Mushbach quoted authorities to sustain his position, among others, Kent, com. 292, and 2 Cranch, 397. He also said that the further claim made by the friends of the Barbour bill, that the constitutional provision preserving the inviolability of contracts applied to contracts between individuals, and not to contracts made by States, although such was the opinion of many men contemporaneous with the formation of the Constitution, is not sustained by the authorities of the present day. On the contrary, nearly all the leading cases on the subject decided by the United States Supreme Court, Woodruff vs. Trapnell, New Jersey vs. Wilson, Fletcher vs. Peck, Freeman vs. Nichols, and numerous others, arose upon contracts made by sovereign States, and it was held they could not impair them.

Passing to another branch of the subject, Mr. Mushbach said he could not vote for the Barbour bill, because it was a part of, or a prelude, or an opening overture to a forcible readjustment bill on the basis of 3 per cent. He would not consent to such a forcible measure, not only because it was wrong in principle, but because, with the present revenues of the State, under rigid economy, the State could keep the wheels of government moving, and maintain the public school system—a system to which he was the firm friend—and at the same time pay four per cent interest on the public debt, which the creditors would willingly accept and compromise on those terms. Member after member has stated upon this floor that they are in receipt of numerous letters from the creditors of the State in this and other countries to the effect that they will gladly take a 4 per cent tax receivable coupon bond in exchange for those now held by them. Such a bill Mr. Mushbach would vote for if it left the creditors free to accept, and did not purport to compel them. It is capable of mathematical demonstration that our revenues will pay 4 per cent, and it is repudiation to pay less, for repudiation consists as much in the failure to pay what we are able as in the direct refusal.

The report of the Finance Committee shows that:—  
The net receipts of the State of Virginia are \$2,419,214 64  
From this they deduct the current expenses of gov't \$1,078,886 32  
Amount due public schools..... \$1,340,328 32

Leaving net revenue applicable to the payment of interest only..... \$877,616 46

This statement has been sent out broadcast to the people without reference to the fact that with certain laws now on the statute book, the effect of which has not yet been fully felt, but will be before the close of the fiscal year, and with certain retrenchment measures now before the Legislature, which will be passed if the "funders" can do it, the revenue of the State will be largely increased, the governmental expenses greatly reduced, and the net amount applicable to the payment of interest correspondingly augmented. It should be recollected that to the amount of gross revenue as given by the Finance Committee should be added the Auditor's own estimate of \$300,000, to be received the coming year from the Morfeet register, which, if repealed, will be replaced by an increase of tax on licenses to sea fishers, and the net amount will be increased. It should also be known that the State expects to retrench in the government expenses of the State to the extent of about \$350,000, by revising the criminal law, reducing the circuits, changing the mode of conveying convicts to the penitentiary, cutting down the pay of legislators and officers of the government whenever it is right to do so, and reducing the number of members of the House from 132 to 100, and of the Senate correspondingly. When this is done and the biennial session law begins to operate the net revenue applicable to the payment of interest will be largely increased, and it is apparent, as far as calculation and estimates can prove anything, that 4 per cent on our entire indebtedness can be paid without increasing taxes. The opposition to economy has not come from the most abused "funders." The records of the House and Senate show that it was not by their votes that the economical measures, so far introduced, have been delayed and sent back to the committee rooms. Mr. Mushbach submitted a statement of the present liabilities of the State, and a calculation of the probable revenue applicable thereto, to sustain his position. He said, in making the statement, he omitted the amount due the sinking fund on the Virginia bonds held by it, because it was a question with him, and the same idea was held by a number of members, whether the sinking fund should be longer kept up. Would it not be better to pass a law to destroy the bonds now in the fund and start a new fund on different principles? Ought they not to cease to bear interest payable by the State with money taken from the tax payers, when they have been redeemed by the State? If it was done, some \$200,000 of interest, annually increasing in amount, would be saved. Could not the money as it comes into the sinking fund be invested in securities other than those of this State, which will draw their own interest, and not from Virginia? Is it right for Virginia legislation to depreciate her own bonds, and then go on the market and buy them up at a discount of 40 to 50 per cent, put them in a sinking fund and compel her people to continue to pay interest on them at their face value? The constitution of the State provides for the payment and extinguishment of the principal of the State debt, and shall be continued until the extinguishment of such State debt, but this ought not to be construed to mean that when Virginia's

bonds are bought up and put in the fund, they shall remain and continue there, drawing interest indefinitely. If a tax for sinking fund purposes is levied and continued, that is collected every year and used in the manner indicated, is not that a compliance with the constitutional provision? Does the constitution necessarily require the continuance of the bonds themselves after they get in the fund? Mr. Mushbach said that if the bill now under consideration was passed and a law no creditor could be expected to fund his bonds under the measure coming after it. It is a declaration to him that his new bonds would be worthless for that it involves the idea that the rid of the debt he can do so by means of a preamble. The proper solution of the debt question is to pass a fair 4 per cent bill putting all our creditors on the same footing—consolidate and peel—enforce the present revenue laws, or if it is considered necessary to make certain changes, substitute something that will bring in as much money—enact and put into operation the economical measures now pending—then adjourn, go home and stay there for two years. At the end of that time there is every indication that the vote given will be settled—Virginia's credit restored, her honor saved and further agitation rendered unnecessary. In conclusion he explained his vote on the resolution of Mr. Harrison, of Sussex, declaring it inexpedient to increase the present rate of taxation (50 cents per \$100) on real and personal property.

##### MR. HUNTER'S SPEECH.

Mr. Speaker:—I arise to say something on the subject of the State's indebtedness. I do not desire to take up the attention of the House for any length of time, and only say a few brief words to explain my position on the public debt.

I have, Mr. Speaker, carefully refrained from participating in either caucus of the General Assembly, for in my humble judgment it did more to divide the conservatives among themselves than all other causes combined. I did not pledge myself in caucus to vote for any man or any set of men. Neither did I pledge myself for any measure or measures, but in all honesty of purpose to espouse those measures which are most conducive to the welfare of the people of this State. I have endeavored earnestly to find and follow through the tangled labyrinth of the State debt some road which I could conscientiously follow, and I find there are but three roads to take, either one of which I must choose.

The first proposition is that to pay the interest of the State debt we must increase the taxation heavily.

The second is to let the matter stand as it is, and leave to posterity the task of cutting this Gordian knot.

The third road is to make the best arrangement we can with the creditors, and after showing our liabilities pay out the whole of the assets over our expenses if running the government.

These three words are the only ones we can travel, and we must choose either one or the other of them. As for me, my road is chosen, and I will follow it, no matter where it ends, and no matter where it leads, and no matter what the consequences may be.

As for the first proposition to increase taxation the House by a vote of one hundred against four refused to do so, and I think I speak the sentiments of nine-tenths of my constituents when I say that it is one of the questions which would be a maternal blow of any representative that would be willing to add one single penny to the fearful burden of taxation that the people are now staggering under. The public debt is like the old man of the sea straddling Snodgrass's shoulder. It is paralyzing all of the State's energies, discourages immigration, and blocks all the wheels of trade. Sir! sooner than to give my voice to increase the taxation one cent I would let my arm wither and my tongue refuse its utterance. The people are taxed as much or more than they can stand, but even now when the cry of distress comes from all sections of the Commonwealth, when the red flag of the sheriff hangs from so many houses, to add to the present taxation as much again, then, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I for one will never by countenance or my vote agree to increase taxation one dime. It is the last straw that breaks the camel's back, and that last straw in the shape of present taxation I for one will never accept.

The second road which we can follow is to let the vexed subject alone, and to leave to posterity the vexed task of settling it. To confess here that as representatives of the people we are not able to meet the issue, and that we shrink from the duty. I know not what others call it, but I, sir, call such a course cowardice; cowardice of the most shameful stamp, and cowardice of dishonor. For such a course, would it be followed, would simply be repudiation, a repudiation of that lowest type of a rogue, the sneak thief, and not the open repudiation of the reckless, bold highwayman.

The way, sir, to meet all danger, all trouble, all woe, is to look it square in the face, and in all its magnitude, the mountain of debt which has piled up upon us, and to say to ourselves, "I see the State treasury so empty that not a dollar rattles in its till; when I hear the cries of distress among my people, and the wail of poverty sounding in my ears; when my eyes behold the fearful line of figures of what we owe, and the small amount which we can pay, then, and only then, I felt as if any measure that looked to the solving of this question, and an amicable adjustment of this debt would be eminently fair and proper and just."

Sir, I love Virginia. She is my world, my earth. Outside of her borders I have neither interest or ambition. As Caleb Cushing once said of his State I say of mine: "Sir, I have roamed through the wide world to find hearts nowhere warmer than her's, soldiers nowhere braver, patriots nowhere purer, wives and mothers nowhere truer, maidens nowhere lovelier, green valleys and bright rivers nowhere greener or brighter, and I will not be silent when I hear her patriotism impugned or her honor questioned. Living, I will defend her, dying, I would pass in my last expiring breath, to utter a prayer of fond remembrance to my native Virginia."

Sir, I have heard much spoken of the honor of the Old Commonwealth by men who have never made any sacrifice for her. Honor is a grand thing, the grandest on earth, dearer than life, sweeter than liberty, but as Madam Roland pathetically said of liberty, we can say, "Oh, honor, what crimes are committed in thy name!" Yes, a plighted promise to swim a river and try, but after getting half way across, the current carries me down with resistless might, and I am glad to get back to the shore from whence I left. I forfeit no honor in that, my will was good, but my arms were weak.

The proof of how much a man loves his State was shown by the past fifteen years of her history; those who stood by her staunchly then, in her hour of deadly peril and deepest woe, are the ones most likely to guard and protect her now.

Sir, I have done my humble share to keep her honor and escutcheon stainlessly fair, as a proud soldier in the ranks of that glorious army of Northern Virginia, as a writer beautifully styled them, "those tattered sons of fortune, and the nursing of many a dark and stormy hour." I know what it is to wait during the long months of the winter bivouac, cold, half naked and half starved, I know what it is to lay tossing, consumed with fever in the couch in the hospital, with the name tacked to the headboard, so that if death should claim its victim, his name could be written on a piece of plank by some loving comrade to mark for a brief time his last resting place. I know what the forced march is, when mad with hunger and faint with thirst, the starved battalions kept on with their shoulders galled by the heavy muskets. Sir, the honor of Virginia was dear to us then, it is as dear to us now. With me the adoration of my boy for my State has grown into the steady love of my man. Virginia is everything, outside the space of her rimmed borders is naught. She is my world

greater to me, dearer to me than all the universe beside. With her all my hopes, my desires, my aspirations lie, and if I could bring peace and prosperity again to her, if I could make glad the heart, and brighten the eye of every son and daughter of my love Old Commonwealth, from the bottom of my heart and not from the tip of my tongue, when I say I would do it willingly, cheerfully, gladly, proudly.

And now, sir, I come to the Barbour bill, which has excited all this discussion.

Leave me, sir, an extremist, and what is known as a last dollar man; I came with the intention of listening to no compromise short of keeping faith with the creditors, but, sir, my views have been changed by the course of the debate in this House, have undergone a radical change. I have seen many things I had no idea of before; I have seen that the management of the treasury is all wrong; I have seen that the treasury of the proud old State is absolutely bankrupt; I have seen member after member get up on this floor and denounce the funding act as the liad of all our woes, and I have seen every conservative member of this House, with the exception of two, get up and vote against any increase of taxation. This being the case, how do we stand? What position do we occupy? Only this: if the debt must be settled and the funding act regarded, then the taxation must be increased; if taxation is not increased then the whole contract of the funding act falls to the ground. "Falsus in uero, falsus in omni," is a good old motto which suits our case exactly. If we don't increase taxation to meet our obligations then what in the name of God are we to do; sit down, wait, and cover before the storm; I, for one, say never, and believing that the salvation of the conservative party in this State (which is divided into two hostile classes), depends on a speedy adjustment of the debt question, I shall vote for the Barbour bill, the only one which is likely to accomplish that object. Three per cent is guaranteed, certain, and all the increased revenue goes in the sinking fund. I must confess I would rather the rate of interest would be four per cent, but as the distinguished gentlemen from Culpeper, who is chairman of the Finance Committee, reports that the State cannot pay more, then I accept his word and the words of the rest of the committee as facts, and shall support the bill.

I do so all the more willingly because if the bondholders are not satisfied they can arbitrate and nullify the entire legislative proceedings by applying to the Supreme Court of the State and of the United States.

The gentleman from Matthew, in an eloquent and effective speech, bids us pause before we take a step forward, for fear we would slide down a declivity. Sir, we have been pausing for ten years, and slowly sliding down to the black depths of utter repudiation all the while. We are like a sick patient slowly sinking into death, and the cry is don't give him any medicine for fear it will kill him. Or rather, like the sick patient described by Gil Blas, who, fallen into a chronic invalid, sent for the two most famous physicians in all Spain. It happened that the surgeons were rival doctors, and on arriving at the house of the sufferer, and being shown to his room, they, instead of examining the sick man, fell into violent dispute as to the method of treatment, and both being lawyers once, they kept up the wordy and scientific contest until the patient died.

I intend to support bill No. 92, what is known as the Barbour bill. Some of its features I do not like. If the interest was fixed at four per cent, I would vote for it gladly, but as the State declares, through its Finance Committee, it cannot afford to pay but three per cent, then I will support it reluctantly, but still support it, for I know that unless the Barbour bill is passed, no bill looking to the relief of the State will be, and affairs will go on from bad to worse.

I hear gentlemen on the other side use as their strong argument, what the world, and what the North will say about Virginia's honor if she scales the debt? Why, sir, what do we care about what the world says, so that our people are prosperous and happy. When we were struggling through the fiery furnace of civil war, when our people were beseeching the ear of heaven, and invoking the help of the world for assistance, did their friendly sympathy, or what they thought, so much as feed one starving soldier? I think not; I am certain not. And as for the North, what do they care whether or not, we are prosperous and happy. When we were struggling through the fiery furnace of civil war, when our people were beseeching the ear of heaven, and invoking the help of the world for assistance, did their friendly sympathy or what they thought, so much as feed one starving soldier? I think not; I am certain not. And as for the North, what do they care about what the New York Tribune says about us? whose articles are copied with so much satisfaction by the funders' organ in the State. What do we care? Ah, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, when the bar-burner Sheridan was quoted to us as authority. The New York Tribune prating to us to keep the honor of Virginia unsullied! The sublime impudence of cheek can no further go than that. The New York Tribune, that bounded us down for years; and when the bar-burner Sheridan came out in double leaded trowsers, in flonkish, devilish exultation, and said that if Sheridan's war was done that a crow flying over the once fairest portion of Virginia would, because the land was a desert and a waste, be forced to take a hawk's call along with him. Sir, you may as well attempt to find shame in charlatan, honor among thieves, or virtue in a brothel, as to find sympathy for Virginia outside of her geographical limits.

Sir, I shall vote for the bill. If events prove afterwards that it is an unfortunate step to which we will be one more regret added to my life, but still I would have the proud consciousness of knowing that I acted from the highest, purest motives, and if I erred it was an error of the head, and not, thank God, the error of the heart.

##### Letters from Richmond.

[Correspondence of the Alexandria Gazette.]  
RICHMOND, February 9, 1878.

This afternoon the argument in the case of Lewis, McComb &c., vs. the Washington & Ohio Railroad Company was concluded. Mr. McKenzie, the President of the road, was in good spirits. Indeed he laughed at the idea of being displaced. Judge Neeson, one of the attorneys for the other side, was one of Mr. McKenzie's best personal friends, and took occasion to express to that gentleman the regret he felt at having to be arrayed against him. The Judge, after hearing the argument, decided to appoint a receiver and appointed Mr. Cassius F. Lee as receiver with bonds in the penalty of \$25,000. The decree will be entered on Monday. The argument was concluded by Judges Meredith and Neeson. The decree will displace Mr. McKenzie, the President and all the corporation officials and subjects the corporation to the immediate control of the court for the benefit of the creditors of the Railroad company. Mr. McKenzie was completely overcome when the decision of the court was announced.

There seems to be an impression that the Barbour tax bill will not so readily pass the Senate nor will Mr. Brooke's bill pass the House. It may be that an attempt to compromise will be made, but I doubt whether it will be successful unless a call is made for an extra session.

Rev. F. A. Meade, a grandson of Bishop Meade, was to day ordained as a priest at St. Mark's Church. The ordination services were conducted by Bishop Whittle assisted by Rev. Dr. Minogero.

COX'S AND NELSON'S ENGLISH GELATINE—for sale by GEO. MCBURNY & SON, 76 B. E. J. MILLER & CO

VASES for decoration, new patterns, rec'd this day

COX'S AND NELSON'S ENGLISH GELATINE—for sale by GEO. MCBURNY & SON, 76 B. E. J. MILLER & CO

VASES for decoration, new patterns, rec'd this day

COX'S AND NELSON'S ENGLISH GELATINE—for sale by GEO. MCBURNY & SON, 76 B. E. J. MILLER & CO

VASES for decoration, new patterns, rec'd this day

COX'S AND NELSON'S ENGLISH GELATINE—for sale by GEO. MCBURNY & SON, 76 B. E. J. MILLER & CO

VASES for decoration, new patterns, rec'd this day

#### Foreign News.

##### THE EASTERN QUESTION.

The Russian Telegraph Agency states that the dispatch of the British fleet to the Bosphorus restores to Russia liberty of action. The object is to co-operate in the maintenance of order and the attainment of a durable and equitable solution of the Eastern question. The fleet will be welcomed as an auxiliary. Any rate, Russia will regulate her attitude by that of England.

Advices from Ragusa state that the Porte objects to Montenegro establishing the line of demarcation for the armistice on the basis of *uti possidetis*.

A renewal of hostilities between Turkey and Montenegro is imminent.

The latest official intelligence from Alexandria shows that a complete understanding has been arrived at between the Russian headquarters and the Turkish delegates.

The further reply from Russia to the Austrian invitation to the Conference says that it is the intention of Russia not to permit the discussion of certain points in the preliminary conditions. In spite of these reservations, it is considered certain in Austria official circles that the Conference will meet, although the same confidence does not exist as to its satisfactory result.

The rumors that the peace preliminaries contain secret clauses relating to the Straits, the limits of Bulgaria and an alliance between Russia and Turkey are denied, although it is understood that the majority of the Turkish Ministry favor an alliance.

Prince Gortschakoff has notified the Powers that since the English Cabinet has resolved to send a fleet to Constantinople, ostensibly to protect the Christians, Russia also contemplates occupying Constantinople from the land, with the same object.

The authorities of the Black Sea ports have removed all restrictions on the export of grain and provisions.

The Turkish forces have evacuated Wilna, Rusebuck, Silistra, Belgrade, and the Caucasus, and have withdrawn from the Caucasus, leaving the line from Rusebuck to Akkum. The neutral zone is now miles broad.

The British fleet has not yet passed the Dardanelles.

It is rumored that the Porte, in pursuance of agreement with Russia, will decline to accept a delegate to the conference.

Prince Gortschakoff insists on presiding at the conference, and Austria is inclined to acquiesce.

Austria is disposed to have the fixing of the duration of the Russian occupation of Belgrade referred to the conference.

Three Austrian men of war have been ordered to the Bosphorus. Italian vessels are also going there.

A number of Russian sailors have gone on board the Sea of Marmora to man certain Turkish men of war which are about to be surrendered.

In the event of a rupture of the armistice the Turks could not occupy the Constantinople lines, as the neutral zone would remain neutral until the end of three days' notice of cessation of hostilities. Preparations are being made to defend the interior lines.

A St. Petersburg correspondent telegraphs as follows:—Notwithstanding Lord Derby's explanations, the sending of the fleet to Constantinople and the Parliamentary vote of credit have produced a profound impression here. Some think that these acts constitute a threat of neutrality justifying immediate war. Fortunately the Government has not adopted the view, but is sincerely desirous of avoiding further complications. It would be dangerous, however, to impose on this conciliatory spirit, which the general public, war with England would be very popular, and in the small circle of which influence the foreign policy of Russia is largely strong measures.

The moment is critical. Even a shipwreck of late on the part of the British Cabinet might have momentous consequences.

A Vienna correspondent confirms the report that British agents have produced a serious impression in both Berlin and St. Petersburg. The question whether the Porte, by admitting foreign men of war, does not give Russia the right to march on Constantinople. All depends on which power can telegraph the fastest to the seat of war. If the Russians, they may bring influence to bear on the Porte to refuse a passage to the British fleet. Dispatches from Constantinople received Saturday night deny that the Porte has granted permission, which looks as though England had applied for a fresh firm. It is rumored that Austria has instructed her Ambassador, Count Zichy, to apply for a firm to admit Austrian vessels if the English fleet is admitted.

LONDON, Feb. 11.—Little confidence in the official confirmed should be placed in the morning's Daily News' Berlin dispatch, stating that Prince Gortschakoff has notified the Powers that since England has resolved to send a fleet to Constantinople ostensibly to protect Christians, Russia also contemplates occupying the city from land with the same object. Other advices direct from St. Petersburg are quite to the contrary. The semi-official Journal *Do St. Petersburg* yesterday published a very temperate article commenting on the dispatch of the British fleet. The article says:—"As far as Russia is concerned we think this measure ought not to make her deviate from the policy she has hitherto followed. Long before the last incident which now brings the English fleet into the waters of Constantinople that eventuality was foreseen and was made the subject of instructions to the Russian commander in chief. It was well informed these instructions directed that the Ottoman Capital should be occupied by the imperial troops and a British fleet should appear before the